

From: Henry Norr
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, kjmweb@fcc.fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 9:02 PM
Subject: Stop it!

Eliminating restrictions on media ownership is an outrageous idea, when there's already so little diversity in the American mass media.
Postpone the vote, then drop the plan!

Henry Norr

From: Allan Miles
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 9 09 PM
Subject: <No Subject>

The F.C.C. is responsible for America's majority not the Radio and T.V. Networks. We have already seen the results of network broadcasts on America's youth. It's time the F.C.C. shows us they still have morals, standards and inherent consciences and that money is not the only control of their operations. Let's not let our standards droop any lower. We've lost prayer in the schools, The displaying of the Ten Commandments. They try to take "Under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance" What are you planning on leaving for the upright Americans who still (yes they are still) the Majority. And yes over 90 percent of America believes in God. Why not shock us and before you put on a program ask this question " Would God be Pleased? and He is more Liberal than you might think For Heaven's sake let us get back to enjoying radio and tv

From: Borener Benjamin I Contr 23 SOPS/IITC
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 9:10 PM
Subject: Media Consolidation

Please do not allow our already monopolized media become even more so

Ben Borener
44 Rush Rd
Henniker NH 03242

From: George E. Fleisher
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 9:16 PM
Subject: Broadcast Ownership Rules

The Honorable Michael J. Copps, Commissioner
I urge you to vote no on the revision to the FCC Regulations in reference to the Broadcast Ownership Rules

Providing the ability for a limited ownership will restrict the ability for open and unbiased information from grassroots organizations.

Sincerely,

George E. Fleisher
3009 Raccoon Valley Road,
Millerstown, PA 27062

From: Luv2Type@aol.com
To: Commissioner Adelstein, Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM
KJMWEB
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 9:16 PM
Subject: (no subject)

"I urge you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections, that for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country."

Sincerely,

A White, Sugar Land, Texas

From: B+B
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 9:18 PM
Subject: No change in the FCC rules

Please vote for no change in the FCC rules Thank you, Bruce Koppenaal
Clovis California

From: Donald Bilyeu
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 9 23 PM
Subject: June 2 meeting to revise cross-ownership standards for broadcast and newspaper industries

Chairman Powell. I am increasingly appalled by the decreasing quality of broadcast media content and can only envision more of the same should the easing of subject regulations permit further monopolization of the broadcast media by the same few organizations. The airwaves belong to the people of this country and diversity of broadcast ownership is the only sure way to promote the airing of diverse views and interpretations of the issues of the day. Local stations must retain some local autonomy for broadcast of local news and emergency alerts. By extension, whether radio, television, cable, or satellite, the same regulations should apply in the name of diversity. Please do not adopt the changes to be considered at the subject meeting. I feel you should instead bring this issue before the people in a way that has not been done to date, either by the FCC or the very media organizations standing to gain the most from the easing of current regulations. Don Bilyeu, Lenox MA

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Doug and Cathy
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 9 32 PM
Subject: Comment on your proposed rule allowing for multimedia giants to purchase more media outlets

This is the first time I have written to comment on any rule

I do not think that your proposed relaxation of regulation by allowing multimedia giants to purchase more media outlets is in the interest of the public. Your function is to serve all the public, not just those non-citizens, such as Mr Murdoch, to assemble more pieces for his news trust/syndicate

Your relaxation of regulations decreases the ability of others to enter the market. Your Commissions purpose is to assist in our 1st Amendment right of expression, not decrease it by allowing mega rich organizations to further monopolize the communications industry. You are not in business to assist business moguls

Please reconsider your relaxation of regulation and focus on issues that affect the public good

From: Sannye
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 9:39 PM
Subject: Fw No Monopoly

----- Original Message -----

From: Sannye
To: mpowell@fcc.gov
Sent: Friday, May 30, 2003 6:39 PM
Subject: No Monopoly

Dear Chairman Powell,

Thanks to OPB, I am aware well aware of how devastating it would be to democracy, to have fewer and fewer owners of broadcasting corporations. I trust you will do the right thing for America and for freedom and vote against this impending legislation. Please do not assume that all Americans are stupid like Enron and Global Crossing did. We do not need another disaster of any kind in this country. I hold you accountable. Knowledge is power. DON'T limit my information to just a few. PLEASE!

Sincerely,
Sannye Phillips
40346 SE Cedar Creek Lane
Sandy, OR 97055

From: sappo2@worldnet.att.net
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 9:46 PM
Subject: rulings

Madam:

Please do not allow the Fcc to loosen rules governing broadcast ownership

Joyce M Simonds

From: Linda Jue
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 9 50 PM
Subject: FCC Ownershp Rules Change

To FCC Commissioners,

A copy of the attached letter was faxed to your office today on behalf of the executive director and board of the Independent Press Association.

Thank you

Linda Jue
Director, New Voices in Independent Publishing
Independent Press Association
2729 Mission St , Ste 201
San Francisco, CA 94114
415/643-4401
Fx 415/643-4402
Web. www.indypress.org

CC: IPA Board

From: Fred Snyder
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 9:53 PM
Subject: Media monopoly

Support MICHAEL COPPS. He is right. Media monopolies control too much of the news and information market as it is. Do not vote to increase the monopolies. Vote to decrease their empires

Fred D. Snyder

From: Bobbiewal@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 9:54 PM
Subject: FCC

I strongly disapprove of loosening the controls on the FCC. Please do not vote to do so on Monday when I understand the vote is to take place. I and many, many other Americans want a fair, unbiased media and feel loosening controls would put too much power in the hands of the few. Roberta D. Dodson, 109 Meadow Lane, Orinda, CA 94563

From: Stuart Bramhall
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 9:58 PM
Subject: June 2nd hearing

Dear Ms Abernathy

I strongly urge you not to abolish FCC rules that protect the U.S. public from the anti-competitive effect of allowing massive media consolidation.

The consolidation of the radio market has been an absolute disaster in terms of local and public affairs programming

Yours sincerely,

Stuart Bramhall MD
710 Coshocton AV
M1 Vernon, OH 43050

From: Carla Cole
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10 00 PM
Subject: Rules Change Considered

Please do not abolish the current rules which bar large media conglomerates from owning all TV and newspapers in any given region. Whatever your reasons for considering this change, they are surely outweighed by the potential loss of diverse information which forms the basis of American citizens' democratic decisions. - C Cole

Carla Ramona Cole
4705 - 21st Ave SW
Seattle, WA 98106
206-937-6373
carla.cole@attbi.com

From: luke curtis
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10:01 PM
Subject: pending dereg vote

Members, FCC

It is very disturbing that the FCC is considering relaxing ownership rules in news media markets. It is a sad linguistic trick to equate this kind of deregulation with increased freedom. The long-term effect on one of the underpinnings of our democracy will be terrible. Only those who are self-deluded or who see some personal or ideological benefit from further poisoning our civic well could seriously consider such a move.

No political system will last forever, but let's give our children and grandchildren the opportunity to taste the freedom of information, and true political debate, without which our democracy will eventually, and surely, die. Are you smart people? What do you really want?

Thank you,

Luke Curtis, Lincoln, VT

CC: linclinc@wcvt.com

From: ~~~~~
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10:13 PM
Subject: Oppose media deregulation and demand public hearings

Dear FCC Commissioners and Chairman Powell,

cc my members of Congress

I urge you to vote to protect the public interest by dropping the FCC's plans to end critical safeguards designed to ensure diversity of media ownership and to delay the unnecessarily rushed vote on media ownership scheduled for June 2nd

Sincerely,
Lana Fisher
4322 Montgomery Street
Oakland, CA 94611

From: Sue E Clark
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10 18 PM
Subject: Please do not relax regulations for ownership of the radio and TV stations

Dear Mr. Powell

Before you vote on June 2nd to loosen media ownership rules, please take a moment to consider what effect such a move will have on program content

We know that television can be profoundly influential in the lives of innocent young children. It affects their perceptions, their world-view, their attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. It is also a sad reality that children spend more time with the television than at any other activity except sleep. But huge mega-conglomerates aren't going to be concerned about how the programming they are putting on TV influences these impressionable youngsters. They're only going to be looking at their profit margins.

Further deregulation will not mean greater opportunity for competition. Rather, it will mean the opposite. More control of the airwaves by the few, with even less accountability to the market than they demonstrate today.

Locally-based station owners know better than network executives in New York and Los Angeles what is best for their communities.

I urge you to fully consider what is truly in the public's best interest, as opposed to what is in the best interest of a handful of major conglomerates. Please do not relax the media ownership rules.

Sue E. Clark
jrseclark@juno.com

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB

From: Carol Rittenhouse
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner
Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10:23 PM
Subject: Docket No 02-277 DO NOT FURTHER CONSOLIDATE OUR MASS MEDIA FOR
YOUR ISSUE'S SAKE .

To The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau

On behalf of myself, my family, and countless other Americans who have worked and fought for freedom through many years, I am writing in reference to Docket No 02-277, the biennial review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules

My family and I are Strongly Opposed to any further consolidation and homogenization of the mass media in this country. The FCC's mandate is to serve the public interest - not corporate profit - and therefore it should expand democratic oversight and continue to restrict market control in the broadcast industry. IF YOU CHOOSE TO DECIDE IN AGAINST THE PUBLIC WILL AND RIGHT, YOU WILL BE ERODING FURTHER THE FREEDOMS THAT WE ALL ENJOY. YOU WILL BE ASKING FOR A SERIOUS SETBACK FOR OUR COUNTRY, AND FOR YOUR OWN ISSUE THERE IS NO REASON WHY YOU CAN NOT TAKE MORE TIME TO ALLOW OTHERS TO COMMENT.

We find it increasingly difficult to have our voice heard in a mass media that is often programmed from distant urban centers and underwritten by powerful corporations with interests quite contrary to our own, and not specific to our locations. Freedom of discourse and open debate on critical issues is compromised when a small elite comes to claim exclusive control over our public airwaves. This is true in large cities and also in remote rural areas where news and opinion is now held hostage by a few private firms. In the worst case scenario, there now exists nothing but a stifling broadcast monopoly. Our freedom is at stake.

Absentee ownership of broadcast media also poses a serious public safety risk as residents of Minot, ND rudely discovered back on January 18, 2002. A train containing hundreds of thousands of gallons of ammonia derailed, releasing a poisonous white cloud. Officials attempted to alert the population over radio - but because six out of the seven Minot stations are now owned by Clear Channel, there was no response for hours. Seeking greater profit, Clear Channel had eliminated much of its workforce and forsaken local news coverage, running instead canned programming on auto pilot from thousands of miles away. For lack of adequate warning, 300 people were hospitalized and numerous livestock killed.

The FCC HAS AN OBLIGATION TO uphold its public mandate by maintaining existing restrictions on broadcast ownership. We also request that the FCC solicit public comment on this issue beyond the current deadline since so many people - particularly isolated rural residents - stand to be affected by this decision. An accessible, diverse, and vibrant communication infrastructure is essential for any democracy and the outcome of this debate should not be determined by the bottomline of corporations.

IF YOU CHOOSE TO DECIDE IN AGAINST THE PUBLIC WILL AND RIGHT, YOU WILL BE ERODING FURTHER THE FREEDOMS THAT WE ALL ENJOY. YOU WILL BE ASKING FOR A SERIOUS SETBACK FOR OUR COUNTRY. THERE IS NO REASON WHY YOU CAN NOT TAKE MORE TIME TO ALLOW OTHERS TO COMMENT.

Sincerely,

Carol Ann Rittenhouse, N8120 Franklin Road, Plymouth, Wisconsin 53073

From: Danielle Michaelis
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10:33 PM
Subject: Vote no on media consolidation until public debate

Dear Comissioner Abernathy:

As an American citizen who is proud of our democracy, I urge you to vote against the rule change that will allow powerful media conglomerates to own numerous media outlets(newspaper, radio,TV) in the same city. The public has not been brought into the debate!
The American people need media coverage from a variety of sources not from a few media conglomerates whose board members sit on the boards of other major corporations in America. How can one get "fair and balanced" news in this country anymore when various corporate and media executives all sit on each others boards? I am certainly not getting it from my FOX news channel (News Corp) or from the MANY radio stations in San Diego ALL owned by Clear Channel. The impending ruling suggests to the American people that media monopolies are A-OK -- not too different from a state-run media in my opinion. If the proposed ruling goes through, it will be a black mark in American history!

Sincerely,

Danielle Michaelis
San Diego, CA

From: David E Booker
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10 37 PM
Subject: broadcast multiple ownership rules

Chairman Powell and Commissioners,

My name is David Booker and I live in a small city in East Tennessee. Not the center of any media empire, but not so far removed from media agglomeration either. To put it as directly as I can, I ask you on Monday, June 2, 2003, to either postpone voting on liberalizing the rules concerning multiple broadcast ownership in the same market or to vote not to liberalize the rules.

In my 46 years of life, I have seen the growth of broadcast TV into a 24-hour, 7-day-a-week medium, the start and growth of cable, the creation of satellite TV, the push for FM radios in all cars, the move from 8-tracks to cassettes, to CDs, and now the advent of satellite radio. Certainly a proliferation in one sense. But unfortunately, I have also seen too much of the same stuff no matter how it was delivered. As Bruce Springsteen put it in one of his songs: "Fifty-seven channels and nothing on." Well, there are more than 57 channels today and I still feel there is validity in that lyric.

I have seen the rules governing cable TV weakened and virtually done away with all for the promise that there would be more competition. That was in the late 1980s. Here I sit just inside the 21st century and there is no competition for the single cable provider in my area, and the rates have increased so fast and so much that I have disconnected myself from it. That was my only option. More choices for a better price has simply not happened, and where I live is not alone in that.

Recently, a multiple award-winning local radio journalist was let go, not for stealing somebody else's work and not for bad reporting, but because the chain that had recently purchased the station he worked at doesn't do local news. It costs too much, they said.

I do not see the weakening of the rules governing TV station ownership being any better for local broadcast TV than what has happened with cable or radio. Right now, 4 major chains own over 70 percent of the radio stations, and the variety on the radio is like being in a redwood forest. Certainly impressive, even awe inspiring, but generally so in only one direction: vertical. While there is some diversity in a redwood forest (and I am not advocating cutting them down), one of the most diverse biospheres in North America is in the Great Smoky Mountains, not too far from where I live. That diversity exists because no one type of tree or plant or animal predominates. There is competition and cooperation and a balance that both nurtures and exploits that diversity. I do not see how the changing of the rules being considered by the FCC serves to create or exploit a similar broadcast diversity. The broadcast companies who say they need this change to survive are already part of larger media structures that all have cable channels associated with them. As far as I can see, many of the redwoods are already in place and local diversity is already suffering from it.

Therefore, I urge you to at least postpone a vote on this issue and give other people, people who are not part of the already growing media redwood structure, a chance to comment. I don't see how companies such as ABC, which is part of Disney or NBC, which is part of GM and has CNBC for cable and MSNBC for the web will suffer by having to possibly wait a little longer. Redwoods don't die overnight.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
David E Booker
124 East Scott Ave.
Knoxville, TN 37917

TITLE 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (MB Docket No 02-277), Cross-Ownership of Broadcast Stations and Newspapers (MM Docket No. 01-235); Rules and Policies Concerning Multiple Ownership of Radio Broadcast Stations in Local Markets (MM Docket No. 01-317), and Definition of Radio Markets (MM Docket No 00-244).

SUMMARY. The Commission will consider a Report and Order concerning its broadcast multiple ownership rules

CC: Commissioner Adelstein, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps, Kathleen Abernathy

From: Jerry Bowman
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10:39 PM
Subject: NO

Do not allow media moguls to expand further

From: Tasmin Pesso
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10 40 PM
Subject: no to deregulation

Dear Commissioners,

You have heard all the arguments, so I needn't bother to list them here. Simply put, I am against deregulation of the ownership laws.

Sincerely,

Tasmin Pesso
116 Alexander Ave.
Larkspur, CA 94939

From: Rita Franchett
To: Mike Powell
Date: Fri, May 30, 2003 10:44 PM
Subject: No to relaxing rules

Commissioners Please, You are working for the public good, right??How can an informed public, and hence democracy, flourish if our sources of information shrink to fewer and fewer providers? Television is so powerful. At least let as many separate owned ones survive as can Do not let papers and tv stations be owned by the same entity in the same market. This is a tremendous responsibility you hold. Rise to that responsibility in spite of heavy pressures you must be getting. Don't change the rules. Already we have too much concentration of ownership!!!! Thank you, Rita Franchett, 5725 Upton Ave S , Mpls Mn 55410

----- USFamily Net - Unlimited Internet - From \$8 99/mo! -----

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein